

CSBG Annual Report

Program Name: Community Services Block Grant

Grantee Name: IN ST Housing and Community Development Authority

Report Name: CSBG Annual Report

Report Period: 10/01/2018 to 09/30/2019

Report Status: Submission Accepted by CO

Report Sections

- 1. Section A - Module 1 - State Administration*
- 2. Section B - Statewide Goals and Accomplishments*
- 3. Section C - CSBG Eligible Entity Update*
- 4. Section D - Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities*
- 5. Section E - State Use of Funds*
- 6. Section F - State Training and Technical Assistance*
- 7. Section G - State Linkages and Communication*
- 8. Section H - Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal Controls*
- 9. Section I - Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System*

Section A - Module 1 - State Administration

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 02/28/2023
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
<p>Note: The reporting timeframes for all information in the administrative module is based on the Federal Fiscal Year, which runs from October 1 of a given calendar year until September 30 of the following calendar year. When completing the annual report, respondents will first indicate the Federal Fiscal Year for which the state is submitting data. The Online Data Collection (OLDC) system will then auto-populate the administrative module with information from the appropriate year (year 1 or year 2) in the accepted CSBG State Plan. States will be able to update information in these sections, as necessary.</p>	
SECTION A CSBG LEAD Agency, CSBG Authorized Official, CSBG Point of Contact	
A1. Confirm and update the following information in relation to the lead agency designated to administer the CSBG in the State, as required by Section 676(a) of the CSBG Act.	
A1a. Lead Agency Indiana Housing and Community Development Authority	
A1b. Cabinet or administrative department of this lead agency	
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Community Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Human Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Social Services Department	
<input type="radio"/> Governors Office	
<input type="radio"/> Community Affairs Department	
<input type="radio"/> Other, describe	
A1c. Division, bureau, or office of the CSBG authorized official Community Programs	
A1d. Authorized official of the lead agency : Instructional note: The authorized official could be the director, secretary, commissioner etc. as assigned in the designation letter (attached under item 1.3). The authorized official is the person indicated as authorized representative on the SF-424M.	
Emily Krauser, Director of Community Programs	
A1e. Street address 30 South Meridian, Suite 900	
A1f. City Indianapolis	A1g. State IN
A1h. Zip 46204	
A1i. Telephone (317) 234-6977	Extension
A1j. Fax (317) 232-2447	A1k. Email csbg@ihcda.in.gov
A1l. Lead agency website www.ihcda.in.gov	
A.2. Please check additional programs administered by the State CSBG Lead Agency during the reporting year (FFY)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Weatherization Assistance Program (WAP)	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)	
<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Department of Agriculture Programs	
Specify	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Programs	
Specify ESG, HOME, CDBG, HOPWA, HCV	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other, Describe	
If yes, Please list below:	

Section B - Statewide Goals and Accomplishments

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492	
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 02/28/2023	
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module		
SECTION B Statewide Goals and Accomplishments		
B.1. Progress on State Plan Goals: Describe progress in meeting the State's CSBG-specific goals for State administration of CSBG under this State Plan.		
<p>Goals: The goals of IHCDCA and the Community Action Network in Indiana are to improve the lives of citizens through efforts to enhance employment, promote education, instruct better income management, improve housing, ensure the availability of emergency services, improve good nutrition, provide linkages to other service providers, promotion of self-sufficiency and improved health. IHCDCA spent the previous year researching best practices across the country and plans to compile these best practices for implementation over FY2019 and 2020. Specifically, IHCDCA is seeking to provide better assistance to the Community Action Agencies in regards to meeting and exceeding the Organizational Standards (IM138) and State Standards as provided in the Comprehensive Administrative Review (CAR Tool). This assistance would come in various forms, but organizational stability, strategic planning, and revenue diversification will be points of emphasis. Indiana has also been researching best practices in Community Action innovation and plans to assist the network in providing innovative solutions to problems identified in the Community Needs Assessment. As Indiana prepares for the release of new census data, 2019 and 2020 will serve in partnership with the Community Action Agencies and the Indiana Community Action Association, as a period of analysis, reflection and possible alterations to the CSBG allocation formula. In regards to the CSBG allocation formula, Indianas goal over the next two fiscal years is to be prepared, regardless of actual formula changes, for the impact of updated census data to the CSBG approved formula. Finally, IHCDCA continues to improve on past ACSI scores. IHCDCA has been and will continue working with the Community Action Agencies on areas of improvement in the state oversight of the funding. IHCDCA hopes to see an increase in participation in the survey from respondents, as well as an increase in the overall ratings and score. Please see the attached action items that have been taken thus far in response to the latest ACSI score.</p>		
<input type="radio"/> All Goals Accomplished		
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Goals Partially Accomplished		
Describe Progress In 2019, IHCDCA partnered with the Indiana Community Action Association to provide trainings related to topics highlighted in the State Plan as being particularly important for Indiana CAAs: revenue diversification, workplace culture, cyber security, problem solving, etc. During monitoring visits, IHCDCA staff noticed common issues with strategic plans developed by consultants, so the Monitoring team created a CSBG Strategic Planning Consultants Guide, to help agencies develop Strategic Plans that meet organizational standards. A Governing Board Management Tool was also introduced to help agencies better track their Tripartite Compliance. In terms of innovative solutions, at the end of FFY2019, IHCDCA began negotiating with United Way of Central Indiana to lead a series of trainings on Two-Generation approached to service programs in FFY2020. IHCDCA staff have also encouraged the CSBG Committee of the Indiana Community Action Agency to begin creating proposals for updates to the funding formula; those proposals are expected to be presented to IHCDCA in the spring of 2020. And finally, IHCDCA saw a jump in its ACSI scores, due in part to updated communications and monitoring policies, and also to the increased participation of Indiana Eligible Entities..		
<input type="radio"/> Not Accomplished		
Explain		
Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 1Sa(i) and will be used in assessing overall progress in meeting State goals.		
B.2. CSBG Eligible Entity Overall Satisfaction Targets: In the table below, provide the State's most recent target for CSBG Eligible Entity Overall Satisfaction during the performance period (FFY).		
Prior Year Target	Most Recent American Customer Survey Index (ACSI) Score	Future Target
0	74	77
Instructional Note: Because the CSBG State Plan may cover two fiscal years, annual updates related to CSBG Eligible Entity satisfaction should be provided in this annual report. The State's target score will indicate improvement or maintenance of the State's Overall Satisfaction score from the most recent American Customer Survey Index (ACSI) survey of the State's CSBG Eligible Entities. States that did not receive ACSI scores (i.e. States with only a single CSBG Eligible Entity) should not complete Item B.2, but should provide narrative descriptions of other sources of customer feedback and the State's response to that feedback in question B.3. For more information on the ACSI and establishment of targets, see CSBG Information Memorandum #150 Use of the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI) to Improve Network Effectiveness.		
B.3. CSBG Eligibility Entity Feedback and Involvement: How has the State considered feedback from CSBG Eligible Entities, OCS, public hearings, and other sources, and/or customer satisfaction surveys such as the American Customer Satisfaction Index (ACSI)? What actions have been taken as a result of this feedback?		
IHCDCA staff have made a point to solicit and act on feedback from Eligible Entities and INCAA in multiple ways. After the 2017 ACSI results were made available, IHCDCA made an action plan to address the areas where deficiencies were identified. Those updates to policies and procedures continued to take place into 2019, including having the CSBG Committee review and propose updates to the funding formula so they could be more involved in the distribution of funds; having IHCDCA staff attend both INCAA Board and Committee meetings to provide updates to agencies on both state and national		

issues; and updating training plans based on feedback from eligible entities via surveys and their community action plans. IHCD staff also presented at the annual state association conference about how the state as a network is or is not meeting organizational or state standards; this was based on feedback from agencies asking for updates on state progress. Work also began on updated monitoring policies, which were published in FY2020; many updates were based on feedback from agencies during previous monitoring rounds.

B.4. State Management Accomplishment:

Describe what you consider to be the top management accomplishment achieved by your State CSBG office during the reporting year (FFY). Provide examples of how administrative or leadership actions led to improvements in efficiency, accountability, or quality of services and strategies.

In 2018 IHCD started the process to bring all monitoring in-house. In 2019, a Fiscal Monitor was hired full-time to assist with monitoring of CSBG, EAP and Weatherization. This has allowed for better communication within each program and between programs, which has allowed IHCD staff to better track and respond to trending issues.

B.5. CSBG Eligible Entity Management Accomplishments:

Describe three notable management accomplishments achieved by CSBG Eligible Entities in your state during the reporting year (FFY).

Describe how responsible, informed leadership and effective, efficient processes led to high-quality, accessible, and well-managed services and strategies.

Indiana Community Action Programs took steps to prepare for the future by focusing on staffing and succession planning. PACE established a Management Partnership Program (MPP) that partners new managers with seasoned managers during their first years (1-3) of being in a supervisory role and being on the management team. Each quarter, new managers are assigned a seasoned manager to meet with to gain information on the agency, job duties and supervision styles. After many years of service, several members of Lincoln Hill Development Corporations (LHDC) management team have decided to retire at the end of 2019 or early in 2020. Planning for those pending retirements provided an opportunity to restructure LHDCs organizational chart, promote current employees to fill the vacancies that will be created by those retirements, enhance LHDCs ability to develop new services, and expand Resource Coordination. Community Action of Greater Indianapolis took the opportunity to turn around their organization by focusing on satisfying all the requirements of their Quality Improvement Plan resulting from their 2018 Comprehensive Accounting Review (CAR) from the Indiana State Office. One of the key strategies was hiring a full-time compliance manager to ensure that all requirements of the Board, staff, and community partners are met. Other new hires included the Human Resources (HR) Director, Executive Administrative Assistant, and Fiscal Manager. Managements decision to create or restructure these key positions helped to stabilize and revolutionize the program spending at CAGI in multiple departments.

B.6. Innovative Solutions Highlights:

Provide at least three examples of ways in which a CSBG Eligible Entity addressed a cause or condition of poverty in the community using an innovative or creative approach. Provide the agency name, local partners involved, outcomes, and specific information on how CSBG funds were used to support implementation.

In 2019 Northwest Indiana Community Action (NWICA) partnered with several other local organizations and individuals to organize and present the Reimagine Conference. The objective of the conference is to inspire collaborative initiatives in communities that take a trauma-responsive approach to community development and public health efforts. The conference is designed to deepen participants understanding of the science of trauma and Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and what it means to be trauma-responsive at home, at work, and in the community. During 2019, TRI-CAP Community Action Agency (TRI-CAP) partnered with the City of Huntingburg and a private developer to create needed workforce housing designed for individuals entering the workforce and establishing their first residence. This 56-unit Wagon Works housing project is part of the community plan to design affordable housing for low-income individuals, as Huntingburg is designated as an opportunity zone with a housing shortage. The partnership between TRI-CAP and Paragus, the housing developer, is structured to generate more sustainable developer fees and service delivery income than previous housing projects. Western Indiana Community Action (WICA) used CSBG funds to support a Medical Assistance program. They found that Prescription assistance is the most needed type of assistance for their clients because no other non-profit organization in their area provides this type of assistance for low-income citizens.

Section C - CSBG Eligible Entity Update

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services				OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492		
CSBG Annual Report				Expiration Date: 02/28/2023		
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module						
SECTION C CSBG Eligible Entity Update						
C.1. CSBG Eligible Entities: The table below includes a list of CSBG Eligible Entities in the State as described in the CSBG State Plan for this reporting year (FFY). Please review and note any changes or updates in this information. This table should include every CSBG Eligible Entity to which the State allocated 90 percent of CSBG funds during the reporting period (FFY). The table should not include entities that only receive remainder/discretionary funds from the State or tribes/tribal organizations that receive direct funding from OCS under Section 677 of the CSBG Act.					C.2. Changes to Eligible Entities List: Did the list of eligible entities under item C.1 change during the reporting period (FFY)? If yes, briefly describe the changes.	
C.1a. CSBG Eligible Entity	C.1b. Public or Non Profit	C.1c. Type of Entity (Choose all that apply)	C.1d. Geographical Area Served by County (Provide all counties)	C.1e. Brief Description of "Other"	C.2a. Yes/No	C.2b. Briefly describe changes
Area IV Agency on Aging and Community Programs, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Carroll, Clinton, Tipton, Wabash		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Area Five Agency on Aging and Community Services, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Cass, Howard, Miami, Tipton, Wabash		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Community Action of Greater Indianapolis, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Boone, Hamilton, Hendricks, Marion		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Community Action of Northeast Indiana, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Allen, DeKalb, LaGrange, Noble, Steuben, Whitley		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Community Action Program of Evansville and Vanderburgh County, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Gibson, Posey, Vanderburgh		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Community Action of Southern Indiana, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Clark, Floyd, Harrison		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Community and Family Services, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Adams, Blackford, Huntington, Jay, Randolph, Wells		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Community Action Program, Inc. of Western Indiana	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Benton, Fountain, Montgomery, Parke, Vermillion, Warren		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Human Services, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Bartholomew, Decatur, Jackson, Johnson, Shelby		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Hoosier Uplands Economic Development Corp.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Lawrence, Martin, Orange, Washington		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Interlocal Community Action Program, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Delaware, Fayette, Hancock, Henry, Rush, Wayne		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Job Source - Central Indiana Community Action Program	Public	Local Government Agency	Grant, Madison		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Lincoln Hills Development Corporation	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Crawford, Perry, Spencer		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	

North Central Community Action Agencies, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	LaPorte, Pulaski, Starke		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Northwest Indiana Community Action Corp.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Jasper, Lake, Newton, Porter		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Ohio Valley Opportunities Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Jefferson, Jennings, Scott		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
PACE Community Action Agency, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Daviess, Greene, Knox, Sullivan		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
REAL Services, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Elkart, Fulton, Kosciusko, Marshall, St. Joseph		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
South Central Community Action Program, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Brown, Monroe, Morgan, Owen		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Southeastern Indiana Economic Opportunity Corp.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Dearborn, Franklin, Ohio, Ripley, Switzerland, Union		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Dubois-Pike-Warrick Economic Opportunity Committee	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Dubois, Pike, Warrick		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	
Western Indiana Community Action Agency, Inc.	Nonprofit	Community Action Agency (CAA)	Clay, Putnam, Vigo		<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Mark for Delete	

C.3. Total number of CSBG eligible entities:

22

Instructional Note:

Limited Purpose Agency refers to a CSBG Eligible Entity that was designated as a limited purpose agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 for the fiscal year 1981, that served the general purposes of a community action agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act; did not lose its designation as a limited purpose agency under Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act as a result of failure to comply with that Act and that has not lost its designation as an CSBG Eligible Entity under the CSBG Act.

Instructional Note:

90 Percent funds are the funds a State provides to CSBG Eligible Entities to carry out the purposes of the CSBG Act, as described under section 675C of the CSBG Act. A State must provide "no less than 90 percent" of their CSBG allocation, under Section 675B, to the CSBG Eligible Entities.

Section D - Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492			
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 02/28/2023			
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module				
SECTION D Organizational Standards for Eligible Entities				
Note: Reference CSBG Information Memorandum #138 State Establishment of Organizational Standards for CSBG Eligible Entities				
D.1. Assessment of Organizational Standards: The CSBG State Plan indicated that the State would use the following organizational standards for its oversight of the CSBG:				
<input checked="" type="radio"/> The State will use the CSBG Organizational Standards Center of Excellence (COE) organizational standards (as described in IM 138)				
<input type="radio"/> The State will use an alternative set of organizational standards				
D.1a. How did the State assess CSBG Eligible Entities against organizational standards, as described in IM 138?				
<input type="checkbox"/> Peer to Peer review (with validation by the State or State-authorized third party)				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Self-assessment (with validation by the State or State-authorized third party)				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Self-assessment / Peer review with State risk analysis				
<input type="checkbox"/> State - authorized third party validation				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Regular, on-site CSBG monitoring				
<input type="checkbox"/> Other				
D.1b. Describe the assessment process as implemented by the State. Please describe any changes in the assessment process that occurred since the time of the State plan submission. Please note that with the exception of regular on-site CSBG monitoring, all assessment options above may include either on-site or desk review (or a combination). The specific State approach should be described in the narrative. Indiana conducts a comprehensive administrative review at a minimum of every 3 years for each of the CAAs. Indiana has utilized a Comprehensive Administrative Review (CAR) monitoring tool that includes organizational standards, and has implemented a Risk Assessment Tool that may result in different frequencies and follow-up steps to monitoring. In addition to review of staff, client and agency documents, a monitoring visit includes interviews with Governing Board Members and agency staff leaders. Exit conferences are held with Executive Directors and/or appropriate staff. Monitoring reports are distributed within 30 calendar days from the exit conference. The agencies are given 10 days to respond by either accepting or informally appealing the report. If an agreement is not reached, the agency can formally appeal items contained within the report. Once all items have been agreed upon the agency will make corrective action to the identified deficiencies. In addition to onsite monitoring visits, agencies are monitored through the information submitted in their Community Action Annual Plan, which includes an organizational standard self-assessment, an annual risk assessment, and reviews completed by other programs at IHCD to assess the status of the agency's administration and major programs. When a new agency is designated, IHCD will conduct an onsite review at the end of the entity's first year of service. Follow-up reviews including return visits occur when appropriate and may have different frequencies depending upon the outcome scoring of the risk assessment and/or if there are less favorable outcomes from the site visit on goals and requirements. Other reviews are conducted as appropriate including reviews of CAAs with programs that have had other federal, state or local grants terminated. IHCD makes every effort to work with CAAs in the event there are challenges with responding or with sufficient responses. If a response is received that is incomplete or unacceptable, a letter is sent outlining the unacceptable portions and providing detailed guidance to complete their response. No peer review is conducted, unless opted into by the CAA.				
D.2. Organizational Standards Performance: In the table below, please provide the percentage of CSBG Eligible Entities that met all State-adopted organizational standards in the reporting period (FFY). The target set in the CSBG State Plan is provided in the left-hand column. For more information on the CSBG Organizational Standards, see CSBG Information Memorandum # 138.				
Target vs. Actual Performance on the Organizational Standards				
Fiscal Year	State CSBG Plan Target	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met <u>All</u> (100%) State Standards	Actual Percentage Meeting <u>All</u> (100%) of State Standards
2019	95	10	0	0.00%
Progress Indicators <i>Indicate the number of entities that met the following percentages of Organizational Standards</i>				
Note - While the State targets the percent of CSBG Eligible Entities to meet 100% of the Organizational Standards, targets are not set in the State Plan for 90%,		Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 90% and 99% of State Standards	Actual Percentage

80%, and 70% progress indicators.	10	9	90.00%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 80% and 89% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	10	1	10.00%
	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met between 70% and 79% of State Standards	Actual Percentage
	10	0	0.00%

Note: This information is associated with State Accountability measures 6Sa.

D.2a. In the space below, please identify the challenges and factors contributing to the difference between the target and actual results provided in the top row of Table D.2. (above)

Agencies lack sufficient operational procedures/systems required to consistently meet the standards. This may be the result of staff turnover or because agencies have not developed the appropriate systems/process with documentation that shows they are meeting standards. For example, a few agencies not having a Board Calendar of Events has resulted in not providing the annual update for the community action plan, Bylaws not being reviewed every two years, etc. Other times required actions are taken but are not documented in Board Minutes, or dates are not included to show that actions were taken within required timelines. Issues such as these make up many of the missed organizational standards, and in the last two years IHCD has focused a lot on ensuring agencies make the necessary changes to address the issues.

D.2b. Percentage Meeting Organizational Standards by Category.

In the table below, provide the number of eligible entities that met each category of the Organizational Standards. The percentage that met all standards in each category will be automatically calculated and totaled in the bottom row.

Percentage Meeting Organizational Standards by Category			
Category	Number of Entities Assessed	Number that Met all Standards in Category	Actual Percentage
1. Consumer Input and Involvement	10	9	90.00%
2. Community Engagement	10	10	100.00%
3. Community Assessment	10	7	70.00%
4. Organizational Leadership	10	2	20.00%
5. Board Governance	10	1	10.00%
6. Strategic Planning	10	6	60.00%
7. Human Resource Management	10	2	20.00%
8. Financial Operations & Oversight	10	5	50.00%
9. Data & Analysis	10	9	90.00%

D.3. Technical Assistance Plans and Quality Improvement Plans:

In the table below, please provide the number of CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards with Technical Assistance Plans (TAPs) or Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs) in place.

Technical Assistance Plans and Quality Improvement Plans	
Total Number of CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards with Technical Assistance Plans (TAPS) in place	0
Total number of CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards with Quality Improvement Plans (QIPS) in place	2

D.3.a. If the State identified CSBG Eligible Entities with unmet organizational standards for which it was determined that TAPs or QIPs would not be appropriate, please provide a narrative explanation below.

☒ Yes ☐ No

After each monitoring, agencies must create and follow Required Action Plans (RAP) to address deficiencies in both federal and state standards. If the deficiencies are more severe, but not so serious as to qualify for a QIP, the RAP is upgraded to a Modified Qualified Improvement Plan (MQIP). MQIPs and RAPs are used in place of TAPs.

Note: D.3. is associated with State Accountability Measure 6Sb.

QIPs are described in Section 678C(a)(4) of the CSBG Act.

For additional information on corrective action and the circumstances under which a State may establish TAPs and QIPs, see IM-138, Pages 5-6

Section E - State Use of Funds

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492			
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 02/28/2023			
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module				
SECTION E State Use of Funds				
Note: The reporting timeframes for expenditure information is based on the Federal Fiscal Year, which runs from October 1 of a given calendar year until September 30 of the following calendar year. States that operate according to a different fiscal year should analyze actual quarterly obligation of funds and report on obligations made during the time period of the Federal Fiscal Year.				
CSBG Eligible Entity Allocation (90 Percent Funds) [Section 675C(a) of the CSBG Act]				
E.1. State Distribution Formula: Did the State institute any changes in the distribution formula for the CSBG Eligible Entities during the reporting period covered by this report?				
<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No				
E.1.a If yes please describe any specific changes and describe how the State complied with assurances provided in Question 14 of the CSBG as required under Section C76(b)(8) of the State CSBG Act.				
E.2. Planned vs. Actual Allocation: Using the table below, specify the actual allocation of 90 percent of CSBG funds to CSBG Eligible Entities, as described under Section 675C(a) of the CSBG Act. While the CSBG State Plan allows for either percentages or dollar amounts, this table in the administrative report must be based on actual dollars allocated to each CSBG Eligible Entity during the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). For each Eligible Entity receiving CSBG funds, provide the Funding Amount allocated to the CSBG Eligible Entity during the FFY.				
Planned vs Actual CSBG 90 Percent Funds				
CSBG Eligible Entity	Planned		Actual	
	Funding Amount (\$)	Funding Amount (%)	Allocations (Based on State Formula)	Obligations
Area IV Agency on Aging and Community Programs, Inc.	418,038	0.00%	434,074	482,154
Area Five Agency on Aging and Community Services, Inc.	344,290	0.00%	386,187	565,150
Community Action of Greater Indianapolis, Inc.	1,351,614	0.00%	1,402,384	1,475,079
Community Action of Northeast Indiana, Inc.	674,121	0.00%	694,373	725,761
Community Action Program of Evansville and Vanderburgh County, Inc.	362,260	0.00%	351,873	380,342
Community Action of Southern Indiana, Inc.	292,409	0.00%	304,984	304,984
Community and Family Services, Inc.	291,018	0.00%	355,833	380,928
Community Action Program, Inc. of Western Indiana	347,723	0.00%	298,461	332,792
Human Services, Inc.	296,014	0.00%	407,000	477,766
Hoosier Uplands Economic Development Corp.	394,495	0.00%	275,236	309,743
Interlocal Community Action Program, Inc.	264,897	0.00%	549,327	937,700
Job Source - Central Indiana Community Action Program	534,277	0.00%	312,821	312,821
Lincoln Hills Development Corporation	164,645	0.00%	173,909	223,677
North Central Community Action Agencies, Inc.	257,019	0.00%	269,720	269,720
Northwest Indiana Community Action Corp.	845,138	0.00%	877,065	1,097,959

Ohio Valley Opportunities Inc.	208,339	0.00%	219,229	226,298
PACE Community Action Agency, Inc.	275,797	0.00%	286,541	429,461
REAL Services, Inc.	738,179	0.00%	763,471	1,059,295
South Central Community Action Program, Inc.	411,961	0.00%	427,771	511,442
Southeastern Indiana Economic Opportunity Corp.	279,157	0.00%	284,716	339,407
Dubois-Pike-Warrick Economic Opportunity Committee	183,186	0.00%	193,140	211,253
Western Indiana Community Action Agency, Inc.	305,350	0.00%	319,849	439,713
Total	9,239,927	0.00%	9,587,964	11,493,445

E.3. Actual Distribution Timeframe:

Did the State make funds available to CSBG Eligible Entities no later than 30 calendar days after OCS distributed the Federal award? ☐ Yes

☒ No

E.3a. If no, did the State implement procedures to ensure funds were made available to CSBG Eligible Entities consistently and without interruption? ☒ Yes ☐ No

E.3b. If the State was **not** able to make CSBG funds available within 30 calendar days after OCS distributed the Federal award, and was not able ensure that funds were made available consistently and without interruption, provide an explanation of the circumstances below along with a description of planned corrective actions.

Note: Item E.3 is associated with State Accountability Measure 2Sa.

Administrative Funds [Section 675C(b)(2) of the CSBG Act]

E.4. What amount of State CSBG funds did the State obligate for administrative activities during the Federal Fiscal Year? The amount must be based on actual dollars allocated during the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). If you provided a percentage in Question 7.6, please convert to dollars.

State Administrative Funds

CSBG State Plan		Actual Amount Obligated
Target from CSBG State Plan 7.6	If entered in the CSBG State Plan as a percentage, convert and insert your number in dollars based on actual award amount.	
0	\$520,670	\$353,482

E.5. How many State staff positions were funded in whole or in part with CSBG funds in the reporting period (FFY)?

Staff Positions Funded

CSBG State Plan	Actual Number
	40.0

E.6. How many State Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were funded with CSBG funds in the reporting period (FFY)?

State FTEs

CSBG State Plan	Actual Number
0	5.0

Remainder/Discretionary Funds [Section 675C(b) of the CSBG Act]

E.7. Describe how the State used remainder/discretionary funds in the table below

Instructional Note: While the CSBG State Plan allows for either percentages or dollar amounts, this table in the administrative report must be based on actual dollars obligated to each budget category during the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY). States that do not have remainder/discretionary funds will not complete this item. If a funded activity fits under more than one category in the table, allocate the funds among the categories. For example, if the State provides funds under a contract with the State Community Action Association to provide training and technical assistance to CSBG Eligible Entities and to create a statewide data system, the funds for that contract should be allocated appropriately between Row A and Row C. If an allocation is not possible, the State may allocate the funds to the main category with which the activity is associated.

Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measures 3Sa.

Planned vs. Actual Use of Remainder/Discretionary Funds

Remainder/Discretionary Funds Uses (See 675C(b)(1) of the CSBG Act)	Planned		Obligated	Brief Description of Services/activities
	Planned \$	Planned %	Actual \$	
a. Training/technical assistance to eligible entities	\$200,000.00	0.00%	151,887	General T&TA contract with State Association
b. Coordination of State-operated programs and/or local programs	\$0.00	0.00%	19,026	Support for State Point-in-Time Count
c. Statewide coordination and communication among eligible entities	\$0.00	0.00%	0	NA
d. Analysis of distribution of CSBG funds to determine if targeting greatest need	\$0.00	0.00%	0	NA
e. Asset-building programs	\$0.00	0.00%	0	NA
f. Innovative programs/activities by eligible entities or other neighborhood groups	\$150,000.00	0.00%	0	NA
g. State charity tax credits	\$0.00	0.00%	0	NA
h. Other activities, Specify	\$50,000.00	0.00%	10,000	Funding for CAA to pay for fraud investigation, to be paid back after insurance reimbursement.
Totals	\$400,000.00	0.00%	\$180,913	

E.8. What types of organizations, if any, did the State work with (by grant or contract using remainder/discretionary funds) to carry out some or all of the activities in table E.7. (above)

☒ CSBG Eligible Entities (if checked, include the expected number of CSBG Eligible Entities to received funds)

(if checked, include the expected number of CSBG Eligible Entities to received funds)

1

☒ Other community-based organizations

☒ State Community Action Association

☐ Regional CSBG technical assistance provider

☐ National technical assistance provider

☐ Individual consultant

☐ Tribes and Tribal Organizations

☐ Other

If Other Checked

☐ None (the State will carry out activities directly)

E.9. Total Obligations:

Category	Actual Obligations
Obligations to Eligible Entities (from State CSBG 90% Formula Funds)	\$11,493,445
State Administrative Costs	\$353,482
Remainder/Discretionary Funds	\$180,913
Total Obligations in FY	\$12,027,840

E.9a. Prior Year Carryover Of the total amount reported in the row above, the amount that represents carryover funding from the prior fiscal year.	\$2,121,383
E.9b. Carryover for this Fiscal Year Of the total CSBG amount to the State for this Fiscal Year, the amount that was unobligated and will carry forward to the next Fiscal Year.	\$0

Section F - State Training and Technical Assistance

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services				OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492	
CSBG Annual Report				Expiration Date: 02/28/2023	
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module					
SECTION F Training, Technical Assistance, or Both					
F.1. Describe how the State delivered CSBG-funded training and technical assistance to CSBG Eligible Entities by completing the table below. Add a row for each activity: indicate the timeframe; whether it was training, technical assistance or both; and the topic. CSBG funding used for this activity is referenced under Item E.7 (Planned vs. Actual Use of Remainder/Discretionary Funds.)					
Note: F.1 is associated with State Accountability Measure 3Sc					
Training and Technical Assistance					
Training	Topic	Actual Dates		Brief Description	Conducted
		Start Date	End Date		
Training	Fiscal	10/17/2018	10/17/2018	Wipfli In-Depth Training on OMB's Uniform Guidance	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Technical Assistance	Other	10/23/2018	10/23/2018	Team Building	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Other	10/30/2018	10/30/2018	CCAP Training	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Other	11/07/2018	11/07/2018	There is an Art to Major Gifts	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Technical Assistance	Other	11/09/2018	11/09/2018	Team Building	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Fiscal	11/14/2018	11/14/2018	Wage Study Technical Training	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Communication	11/28/2018	11/28/2018	Motivational Interviewing	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Communication	11/30/2018	11/30/2018	Motivational Interviewing	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Reporting	12/14/2017	12/14/2017	State and local poverty data	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Reporting	12/17/2018	12/17/2018	State and local poverty data	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Reporting	12/18/2018	12/18/2018	State and local poverty data	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Fiscal	01/25/2019	01/25/2019	Introduction to Procurement	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Communication	02/08/2019	02/08/2019	Working with Difficult Clients	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Technical Assistance	Other	02/28/2019	02/28/2019	Team Building	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Communication	03/08/2019	03/08/2019	Customer Service and Communication Skills	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Communication	03/11/2019	03/11/2019	Motivational Interviewing	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Technical Assistance	Other	03/28/2019	03/28/2019	Team Building	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Communication	04/23/2019	04/23/2019	Difficult Conversations	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
		05/29/	05/29/	Influence and Negotiation	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

Training	Communication	2019	2029		No
Training	Other	06/04/2019	06/04/2019	Managing to Change the World	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Other	06/18/2019	06/18/2019	Implicit Bias	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Technical Assistance	Fiscal	06/25/2019	06/25/2019	Roundtable for Fiscal staff	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Reporting	08/20/2019	08/20/2019	CSBG Annual Report Training by NASCSP	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Training	Other	09/04/2019	09/04/2019	Simplex	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Technical Assistance	Fiscal	09/11/2019	09/11/2019	Roundtable for fiscal staff	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

**F.2. Indicate the types of organizations through which the State provided training and/or technical assistance as described in Item F.1, and briefly describe their involvement?
(Check all that apply.)**

☐ CSBG Eligible Entities (if checked, provide the expected number of CSBG Eligible Entities to receive funds)

If checked, provide the expected number of CSBG eligible entities to receive funds

☒ Other community-based organizations

☒ State Community Action Association

☐ Regional CSBG technical assistance provider

☒ National technical assistance provider

☒ Individual consultant(s)

☐ Tribes and Tribal Organizations

☐ Other

Section G - State Linkages and Communication

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 02/28/2023
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
SECTION G State Linkages and Communication	
Note: This section describes activities that the State supported with CSBG remainder/discretionary funds, described under Section 675C(b)(1) of the CSBG Act.	
Note: This item is associated with State Accountability Measure 7Sa.	
G.1. State Linkages and Coordination at the State Level: Please review and confirm all areas for linkage and coordination that were outlined in the CSBG State Plan.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) office	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Weatherization office	
<input type="checkbox"/> State Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) office	
<input type="checkbox"/> State Head Start office	
<input type="checkbox"/> State public health office	
<input type="checkbox"/> State education department	
<input type="checkbox"/> State Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) agency	
<input type="checkbox"/> State budget office	
<input type="checkbox"/> Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	
<input type="checkbox"/> State child welfare office	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State housing office	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other	
If Other Describe	
G.1a. Describe the linkages and coordination at the State level that the State created or maintained to ensure increased access to CSBG services by communities and people with low-income people and communities under the CSBG State Plan and avoid duplication of services (as required by the assurance under Section 676(b)(5)) and identified in the CSBG State Plan. Describe or attach additional information as needed and provide a narrative describing activities, including an explanation of any changes from the original CSBG State Plan. IHCDCA CSBG staff continued to work closely with IHCDCA LIHEAP and Weatherization staff, coordinating messaging and requirements when possible. CSBG staff also worked with the Indiana CoC and ESG staff at IHCDCA to keep Community Action Agencies connected to work with homelessness populations without duplicating services, and to support the 2019 Point-in-Time Count. New this year, CSBG staff opened discussions with IHCDCA HCV staff, to discuss CAAs that manage vouchers and the challenges both programs see in monitoring. Finally, IHCDCA continued to partner with the Indiana Community Action state association to provide T&TA and other resources to CAAs.	G.1a. Attachments
G.2. State Linkages and Coordination at the Local Level: Describe the linkages and coordination at the local level that the State created or maintained with governmental and other social services, especially antipoverty programs, to assure the effective delivery of and coordination of CSBG services to people with low-income and communities and avoid duplication of services (as required by assurances under Sections 676(b)(5) and (b)(6)). Review and update the narrative describing actual activities, including an explanation of any changes from the original CSBG State Plan. Attach additional information as needed. In 2019, IHCDCA continued to share news about local anti-poverty efforts and programs that CAAs should take advantage of or be a part of in their communities. An example of this is the work of the Indiana Continuum of Care; IHCDCA CSBG staff made sure that CAAs were made aware of CoC efforts across the state to support the homeless efforts, to help avoid duplication of efforts and to promote possible partnerships.	G.2. Attachments
G.3. CSBG Eligible Entity Linkages and Coordination	
G.3a. State Assurance of CSBG Eligible Entity Linkages and Coordination:	G.3a. Attachments

<p>Describe how the State assured that the CSBG Eligible Entities coordinated and established linkages to assure the effective delivery of and coordination of CSBG services to people with low-income and communities and avoid duplication of services (as required by the assurance under Section 676(b)(5)). Attach additional information as needed.</p> <p>IHCDA continued to track the linkages that Eligible Entities made or maintained, as well as their coordination of services to avoid duplication within their Community Action Plans. Within their plans, Eligible Entities had to identify the funding sources they use, the programs they manage, and the types of partnerships and referrals they use to better ensure their clients receive the assistance they need. In 2018 we are going to evaluate our Family Development Program to focus on self-sufficiency.</p>	
<p>G.3b State Assurance of Eligible Entity Linkages to Fill Service Gaps: Describe how the CSBG Eligible Entities developed linkages to fill identified gaps in the services, through the provision of information, referrals, case management, and follow-up consultations, according to the assurance under Section 676(b)(3)(B) of the CSBG Act.</p> <p>Indiana Community Action Programs have continued to develop and maintain strong linkages to identify and fill service gaps. Some do so by reaching out to new partners, to ensure the other organizations clients have access to the CAAs resources. Job Sources Director of Community Programs met with new leadership of Madison Count Criminal Justice Center to review services offered and to identify needs and gaps for those residents with a criminal history that could eliminate them from utilizing local assistance. Many CAAs frequently survey their clientele to ensure their needs are being met, and bring in community partners to meet those needs when the CAA cannot. Ohio Valley Opportunities identified Mental Health services for children as a service gap, so they signed an MOU with LifeSpring Mental Health Services for a Licensed Clinical Social Worker to provide 100 hours each Head Start PY, to consult, train and support OVO staff on individualized Behavior Management Plans. Finally, some CAAs develop new resources to ensure LI individuals have full access to as many different community partners and programs as possible. REAL Services developed a call center called the Adult and Disability Resource Center. When a person calls into the center, the staff at REAL Services ask the client if they would like to be screened for other services, which include food stamps, Social Security Insurance, Energy Assistance Program, Medicaid.</p>	
<p>G.4. Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) Employment and Training Combined Plan Activities (if applicable): If the State included CSBG employment and training activities as part of a WIOA Combined State Plan, as allowed under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act , provide a brief narrative describing the status of WIOA coordination activities, including web links if available to any publicly accessible combined plans and reports.</p> <p>NA</p>	
<p>G.5. Coordination among CSBG Eligible Entities and State Community Action Association: Describe State activities that took place to support coordination among the CSBG Eligible Entities and the State Community Action Association.</p> <p>All of the CAAs in the State of Indiana choose to be members of the Indiana Community Action Association (IN-CAA). IN-CAA received 2019 CSBG discretionary funding from IHCDA to provide technical assistance, training, and resources to help CAAs increase network capacity. Those resources must be made available to all CAAs that receive CSBG funds from IHCDA, even if they choose not to be an IN-CAA member.</p>	
<p>G.6. Feedback to CSBG Eligible Entities and State Community Action Association: Describe how the State provided feedback to local entities and the State Community Action Association regarding its performance on State Accountability Measures.</p> <p>Feedback from the ACSI was shared with the Executive Directors of CAAs via email and then discussed at an INCAA Board Meeting.</p>	
<p>Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 5S(iii). The measure indicates feedback should be provided within 60 calendar days of the State getting feedback from OCS.</p>	

Section H - Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal Controls

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services				OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492		
CSBG Annual Report				Expiration Date: 02/28/2023		
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module						
SECTION H Monitoring, Corrective Action, and Fiscal controls						
Monitoring of CSBG Eligible Entities (Section 678B(a) of the CSBG Act)						
H.1. Briefly describe the actual monitoring visits conducted during the reporting year including: full on-site reviews; on-site reviews of newly designated entities; follow-up reviews - including return visits to entities that failed to meet State goals, standards, and requirements; and other reviews as appropriate. If a monitoring visit was planned during the year but not implemented, provide a brief explanation in the far right column of the table below.						
Instructional Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 4Sa(i).						
CSBG Eligible Entity	Review Type	Planned Site Visit Date	Actual Site Visit Date		Brief Description of Purpose	Conducted
			Start Date	End Date	Note: If a monitoring visit was a part of the original state monitoring plan, the State may note that this was a routine scheduled monitoring visit. If the visit was not a part of the original monitoring plan, the State will provide a brief explanation for the purpose of the Visit (e.g. a follow-up regarding a special issue). This section should not be used to outline findings, but should simply note the purpose of the monitoring (FFY) (e.g. follow-up regarding corrective actions).	
Area IV Agency on Aging and Community Programs, Inc.	Full onsite	FY1 Q2	04/09/2019	04/11/2019	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Area Five Agency on Aging and Community Services, Inc.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Community Action of Greater Indianapolis, Inc.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Community Action of Northeast Indiana, Inc.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Community Action Program of Evansville and Vanderburgh County, Inc.	Full onsite	FY1 Q2	07/30/2019	08/01/2019	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Community Action of Southern Indiana, Inc.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Community and Family		FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Services, Inc.	No review					
Community Action Program, Inc. of Western Indiana	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Human Services, Inc.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Hoosier Uplands Economic Development Corp.	Full onsite	FY1 Q3	04/30/2019	05/02/2019	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Interlocal Community Action Program, Inc.	Full onsite	FY1 Q1	11/13/2018	11/15/2018	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Job Source - Central Indiana Community Action Program	Full onsite	FY1 Q1	10/10/2018	10/12/2018	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Lincoln Hills Development Corporation	No review	FY1 Q3			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
North Central Community Action Agencies, Inc.		FY1 Q4	05/21/2019	05/23/2019	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Northwest Indiana Community Action Corp.	Full onsite	FY1 Q4	07/09/2019	07/11/2019	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Ohio Valley Opportunities Inc.	Full onsite	FY1 Q4	09/10/2019	09/12/2019	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
PACE Community Action Agency, Inc.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
REAL Services, Inc.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
South Central Community Action Program, Inc.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Southeastern Indiana Economic Opportunity Corp.	No review	FY1 Q4			NA	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Dubois-Pike-Warrick Economic Opportunity Committee	Full onsite	FY1 Q1	10/23/2018	10/25/2018	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Western Indiana Community Action Agency, Inc.	Full onsite	FY1 Q4	06/04/2019	06/06/2019	Routine onsite CAR Monitoring review	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

H.2. Monitoring Policies:

Were any modifications made to the State's monitoring policies and procedures during the reporting period?

☐ Yes ☒ No

If changes were made to State monitoring policies and procedures, attach and/or provide a hyperlink to the modified documents.

H.2. Monitoring Policies Attachments

H.3. Initial Monitoring Reports:

Were all State monitoring reports conducted in a manner consistent with State monitoring policies and procedures and disseminated to CSBG Eligible Entities within 60 calendar days?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If no, provide the actual number of days for initial distribution of all monitoring reports and provide an explanation for the circumstances that resulted in delayed reports.

Note: This item is associated with State Accountability Measure 4Sa(ii).

Corrective Action, Termination and Reduction of Funding and Assurance Requirements (Section 678C of the Act)

H.4. Quality Improvement Plans (QIPs):

Did all CSBG Eligible Entities on Quality Improvement Plans resolve identified deficiencies within the schedule agreed upon by the State and eligible entity?

☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

If no, provide an explanation for the circumstances

Both CFS and CASI continue to work through issues involving fraud and other administrative deficiencies from their FY 2018 QIPs. IHCD has and will continue to work with both on resolving their individual deficiencies.

Note: The QIP information is associated with State Accountability Measures 4Sc.

H.5. Reporting of QIPs:

Did the State report all CSBG Eligible Entities with serious deficiencies from a monitoring review to the Office of Community Services within 30 calendar days of the State approving a QIP?

☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

If no, provide an explanation for the circumstances. A plan to assure timely notification of OCS must be included in the next CSBG State Plan.

Note: This item is associated with State Accountability Measure 4Sa(iii).

Fiscal Controls and Audits

H.6. Single Audit Review:

In the table below, provide the dates of any CSBG Eligible Entity Single Audits in the Federal Audit Clearinghouse that were received and reviewed during the Federal Fiscal Year as required by the CSBG regulations applicable to 45 CFR 75.521. If the audit contained findings requiring a management decision by the State, provide the date the decision was issued.

Employer Identification Number (EIN) of Agency	Date Audit was Accepted by Federal Audit ClearingHouse	State Management Decision Required?	State Management Decision Issued within 6 Months	Date Management Decision Issued (if applicable)
351329223	08/24/2019	No		
237444508	06/17/2019	No		
356059208	07/09/2018	No		
356048441	09/30/2019	No		
351111819	05/30/2019	No		
020591170	12/06/2018	No		
356062298	10/01/2018	No		
351176665	09/05/2019	No		
351121163	08/08/2019	No		
351115492	08/20/2019	No		
351127422	08/21/2019	No		
351116629	09/12/2019	No		
351112746	08/19/2019	No		
351148191	08/26/2019	No		
351112290	08/06/2019	No		
351125641	07/02/2019	No		
351157606	01/16/2019	No		
356050163	07/02/2019	No		
351118476	09/20/2019	No		
351120537	08/14/2019	No		
351115813	09/24/2019	No		

H.7. Single Audit Management Decisions:

Briefly describe any management decisions issued according to State procedures of CSBG Eligible Entity single audit. Provide the audit finding reference number from the Federal Audit Clearinghouse and describe any required actions and timelines for correction.

NA no management decision letters in 2019.

Section I - Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services	OMB Clearance No: 0970-0492
CSBG Annual Report	Expiration Date: 02/28/2023
Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) Annual Report - State Administration Module	
SECTION I Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System	
I.1. ROMA Participation: In which performance measurement system did the State and CSBG Eligible Entities participate, as required by Section 678E(a) of the CSBG Act and the assurance under Section 676(b)(12) of the CSBG Act?	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) System	
<input type="checkbox"/> Another performance management system that meets the requirements of Section 678E(b) of the CSBG Act	
<input type="checkbox"/> An alternative system for measuring performance and results	
I.1a. If ROMA was selected in item I.1, provide an update on any changes in procedures and data collection systems that were initiated or completed in the reporting period. There were no updates to monitoring procedures in FY19. In November 2019, IHCD collected 2020 Community Action Plans, which had been updated to collect information that matches information collected in the annual report; specifically, the CAP required agencies to set targets that they would need to report outcomes for in Modules 3 and 4 of the 2020 Annual Report. The CAP was also updated to include more questions that encourage agencies to reflect on their accomplishments in the previous year to plan for next year.	I.1a. If ROMA was selected: Attachments
I.1b. If ROMA was not selected in item I.1., describe the system the State used for performance measurement. Provide an update on any changes in procedures and data collection systems that were initiated or completed in the reporting period.	
I.2. State ROMA Support: How did the State support the CSBG Eligible Entities in using the ROMA system or alternative performance measurement system in promoting continuous improvement? For example, describe any data systems improvements, support for community needs assessment, support for strategic planning, data analysis etc. Eligible Entities are required to assess community needs and plan for future programming as a part of their community action plan, while the annual report provides them with the opportunity to identify and evaluate results after program implementation. IHCD staff review and provide feedback on both, in order to assist agencies continuously improve. Further support is provided through training opportunities; in 2019, IHCD supported training sessions on SWOT Analyses, Data Collection and Analysis.	I.2. State ROMA Support: Attachments
I.3. State Review of Eligible Entity Data: Describe the procedures and activities the state used to review the ROMA data (i.e. all data from elements of the ROMA cycle) from CSBG Eligible Entities for completion, accuracy, and reliability (e.g. methodology used for validating the data submitted annually by the local agencies). In early 2019, IHCD staff collected and reviewed 2018 Annual Report data from CAAs; each module was inspected for any obvious or common errors, and CAAs were encouraged to address those and review any questionable data. In November 2019, 2020 Community Action Plans were collected, with targets set for the upcoming program year; those were all reviewed to ensure targets made sense given each CAAs past performance. During onsite monitoring visits, the CSBG Monitor reviews each agency's processes for capturing program data, and any deficiencies become actionable items in the follow-up monitoring report.	I.3. State Review of Eligible Entity Data: Attachments
I.4. State Feedback on Data Collection, Analysis and Reporting: State Accountability Measure 5S(ii) requires states to submit written feedback to each CSBG Eligible Entity regarding the entity's performance in meeting ROMA goals, as measured through National Performance Indicator (NPI) data, within 60 calendar days of submitting the State's Annual Report. Has the State provided each CSBG Eligible Entity written, timely (at a minimum within 60 days of the submission) feedback regarding the entity's performance in meeting ROMA goals as measured through national performance data? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	
If no, describe the plan to assure timely notification of the CSBG Eligible Entities within 60 calendar days of submitting the State's CSBG Annual Report.	
If yes, Please describe, Note: This information is associated with State Accountability Measure 5S(ii) Agencies are notified of the acceptance or denial of their ROMA performance measurements through the Community Action Plan and Annual Report submissions. If performance is insufficient the agencies are asked to make applicable revisions.	
I.5. State and Eligible Entity Continuous Improvement. Provide 2-3 examples of changes made by CSBG Eligible Entities to improve service delivery and enhance impact for individuals, families, and communities with low-incomes based on their in-depth analysis of performance data. When TRI-CAP Community Action Program saw that the client volume of their Boonville health clinic	I.5. State and Eligible: Attachments

was too low to sustain, they converted the space into an additional Head Start classroom. The renovation provided their agency with enough space to provide full-day preschool services for all 193 children in their agency. This marked the first time in TRI-CAPs history where they did not have to double-up classroom space for any of their clients. In recent years, Lincoln Hill Development Corporations (LHDC) Head Start program has faced enrollment challenges due to increasing competition from local pre-kindergarten programs. After a thorough review of enrollment and population data and input from Head Start parents and staff, LHDC adjusted its school year to more closely match public school calendars in the counties where LHDC provides Head Start services (Crawford, Harrison, Perry, and Spencer). The agency also secured funding to offer full-day Head Start services for a higher percentage of students. Happily, the program was fully enrolled only one month after classes began for the 2019-2020 school year. Area IV Agency made the decision to restructure its Transportation Program after receiving feedback from the state, and local needs assessments wherein transportation was indicated to be amongst the top priorities for members of our communities. As a result, Area IV Agency worked to rebuild the Transportation Program, starting with rural Tippecanoe County, and moving from volunteer drivers to paid drivers. This change is expected to better meet the community needs by increasing access to medical care, food and community resources.